**"Culture and Human Rights: The Wroclaw Commentaries"**

**TEMPLATE 2 FOR AN ADDITIONAL WEB ARTICLE – Short entry (Issue-Keyword)***NOTE: This template provides a rough idea of envisaged content; if necessary, you can adapt it to better suit your keyword. Additional templates exist for institutional keywords and smaller or larger articles!*

Please write/insert text into the boxes on the right side! **The overall length of this article should not exceed 2-3 columns**, i.e. 100-150 lines or 5-7500 letters (without spaces!) in the format below (Times New Roman 10 pt.). **If you need more space in one box, try to save a corresponding number of lines in other parts of the article** or contact the Editors.

**References** are to be specified in Section 4 and should then be summarized in the text as: [KUOPILA, 2000] for court cases or (Scovazzi, 2013) for literature. We don't have footnotes! Please use official shortcuts for journals, conventions or institutions, which will later be added to a *List of Abbreviations*. Suggested links to other potential keywords should be indicated like this: >> *Discrimination.*

As regards **content and style of the text**, we would like to refer to the concept of the *Wroclaw Commentaries:*

Most of the keyword entries of the *Wroclaw Commentaries* review the relationship between culture, human rights and policies, state practices or societal attitudes. While the Handbook approaches issues mostly from a legal point of view, interdisciplinary elements are also part of the methodology. Entries will normally focus on the cultural (vis-a-vis e.g. the political, economic or social) dimension of human rights – however, in some cases this dimension may still have to be fully developed. Clearly, the concept of the *Wroclaw Commentaries* relies on authors who are able to present and discuss their topic with an open mind, being both precise as regards references and conclusions as well as intelligible for readers coming from different professional fields.

Please remember that the printed Handbook provides comprehensive introductory articles covering the main subject areas (cf. Outline). Therefore, you can fully concentrate on your keyword issue(s)! Once completed, **save the article**, using the keyword and your name, like in this example: *Roma-Bunjes.doc,* then press the **Send button!**

**Title (Keyword):**

**Author:**

**Professional background/Position:**

**Initials** (e.g. K.Ch.):

**Mail @ / Telephone** (for editorial contacts, will not be published!!):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **GUIDE** (will not be published!) | **YOUR TEXT** |
| ***Abstract:*** *Abstracts should not exceed the limit of* ***two sentences or 6 lines or 300 letters****! Advice: Write the abstract and insert relevant catchwords below only after the regular article has been written!* | *Please replace this part of the template text with your original abstract.* |
| **2 or 3 Catchwords:** Format example: **Roma / Sinti / 'Travellers'** | Please replace this text with the catchwords |
| **1. Short definition / explanation of keyword-related issue(s)**, possibly exemplified by a case.  **Length: Up to 7 lines or 350 letters!**  Note: If you need more space, try to save a corresponding number of lines in other parts of the article or contact your Managing Editor. | Please replace this text with your contribution. Before writing the abstract and the main catchwords, you should start here with your regular article. |
| **2. Core messages of European or international legal instruments, eventual court rulings, especially of the ECtHR, or important opinions in the literature** (in your interpretation).  **Length: up to 20 lines or 1000 letters!**  Note: This section should address keyword-issues in the light of European and/or international conventions and court cases, where relevant. However, it could also take up recent opinions in the literature, selected national differences, e.g. in constitutions and laws, as well as political declarations or statements made by stakeholders, etc. to illustrate problems. | Please replace this text with your contribution |
| **3. Conclusions, including consequences for issue-related legal and policy issues or debates**.  **Length: up to 10 lines or 500 letters!**  Note: Conclusions should suggest mainly the potential significance of the above findings for the concrete issue at stake (or for the wider cultural sphere) and related policies, pointing out tendencies or solutions that could be relevant in future conflicts. | Please replace this text with your contribution |
| **4. Key references** (including online resources) **Length: Up to 3 references or 7 lines or 350 letters!** Note: The WRO Commentaries use these formats:  ***Books***: Freestone, David (ed.): *The 1982 Law of the Sea Convention at 30 : successes, challenges and new agendas*, Leiden: Nijhoff (2013)  ***Articles***: Scovazzi, Tullio: "The Law of the Sea Convention and Underwater Cultural Heritage", in David Freestone (ed.): *The 1982 Law of the Sea Convention at 30 : successes, challenges and new agendas*, Leiden: Nijhoff (2013)  ***Cases (only if relevant for your text/conclusions, e.g. indicating new tendencies or conflicts!):***  KUOPILA v. FINLAND (ECtHR 27/04/2000, [27752/95](http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/Pages/search.aspx))  ***Websites***: [www.culturalpolicies.net](http://www.culturalpolicies.net) (accessed 4/2016) | Please replace this text with your contribution |

Please add **a very short CV focusing on your current or recent work** (up to 50 words and, where available, a link to a website with more information) that you would like to see on www.culture-rights.net!